

Douglas J. Dixon (SBN 275389)  
ddixon@hueston.com  
**HUESTON HENNIGAN LLP**  
620 Newport Center Drive, Suite 1300  
Newport Beach, CA 92660  
Telephone: (949) 229-8640

*Counsel for Plaintiffs Match Group, LLC;  
Humor Rainbow, Inc.; PlentyofFish Media  
ULC; and People Media, Inc.*

Brendan P. Glackin (SBN 199643)  
bglackin@agutah.gov  
**OFFICE OF THE UTAH ATTORNEY  
GENERAL**  
160 E 300 S, 5th Floor  
PO Box 140872  
Salt Lake City, UT 84114-0872  
Telephone: (801) 366-0260

*Counsel for the Plaintiff States*

Glenn D. Pomerantz (SBN 112503)  
glenn.pomerantz@mto.com  
**MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP**  
350 South Grand Avenue, Fiftieth Floor  
Los Angeles, California 90071  
Telephone: (213) 683-9100

Brian C. Rocca (SBN 221576)  
brian.rocca@morganlewis.com  
**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP**  
One Market, Spear Street Tower  
San Francisco, CA 94105-1596  
Telephone: (415) 442-1000

*Counsel for Defendants Google LLC et al.*

Karma M. Giulianelli (SBN 184175)  
karma.giulianelli@bartlitbeck.com  
**BARTLIT BECK LLP**  
1801 Wewetta St., Suite 1200  
Denver, Colorado 80202  
Telephone: (303) 592-3100

Hae Sung Nam (*pro hac vice*)  
hnam@kaplanfox.com  
**KAPLAN FOX & KILSHEIMER LLP**  
850 Third Avenue  
New York, NY 10022  
Telephone.: (212) 687-1980

*Co-Lead Counsel for the Proposed Class in In  
re Google Play Consumer Antitrust Litigation*

Paul J. Riehle (SBN 115199)  
paul.riehle@faegredrinker.com  
**FAEGRE DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH  
LLP**  
Four Embarcadero Center, 27th Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94111  
Telephone: (415) 591-7500

Christine A. Varney (*pro hac vice*)  
cvarney@cravath.com  
**CRAVATH, SWAINE & MOORE LLP**  
825 Eighth Avenue  
New York, New York 10019  
Telephone: (212) 474-1000

*Counsel for Plaintiff Epic Games, Inc. in Epic  
Games, Inc. v. Google LLC et al.*

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
11 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
12 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION  
13

14 IN RE GOOGLE PLAY STORE ANTITRUST  
15 LITIGATION

Case No. 3:21-md-02981-JD

16 THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO:

**JOINT STATEMENT REGARDING  
PARTIES' LIST OF CLAIMS SET FOR  
TRIAL**

17 *Epic Games, Inc. v. Google LLC et al.*,  
Case No. 3:20-cv-05671-JD

Judge: Honorable James Donato  
Trial Date: November 6, 2023  
Time: 9:00 a.m.  
Courtroom: 17

18 *In re Google Play Consumer Antitrust  
Litigation*, Case No. 3:20-cv-05761-JD

19 *State of Utah et al. v. Google LLC et al.*,  
20 Case No. 3:21-cv-05227-JD

21 *Match Group, LLC, et al., v. Google LLC, et  
22 al., Case No. 3:22-cv-02746-JD*

1 The parties submit this joint statement of their respective claims that they intend to be tried  
2 on November 6, 2023.

3 In its August 4, 2023 minute order, the Court “directed [the parties] to formulate a joint list  
4 of the specific claims in each MDL member case that will be tried to the jury in the consolidated  
5 trial.” MDL Dkt. 571 at 2. The Court ordered the parties to file this list on October 2, 2023. *Id.*  
6

7 All Plaintiffs assert claims under the California Unfair Competition Law (Cal. Bus. & Prof.  
8 Code § 17200, *et seq.*)<sup>1</sup>, which are purely equitable claims to be decided by the Court. Plaintiffs’  
9 claims that are to be tried to the jury are addressed below.

10 Google’s position in this submission assumes that the claims of both Epic and the Match  
11 Plaintiffs will be tried together. If that were to change, then it is Google’s position that the Court  
12 and the parties may need to revisit the question of which claims and defenses will be tried to a  
13 jury. Google reserves the right to revise this list after further meet and confer discussions.  
14

15 **Epic Games, Inc. v. Google LLC, No. 3:20-cv-05671-JD**

16 **Claims by Epic Against Google**

- 17 1. COUNT 1: Sherman Act § 2 (Unlawful Monopoly Maintenance in the Android App  
18 Distribution Market).
- 19 2. COUNT 2: Sherman Act § 1 (Unreasonable restraints of trade concerning Android App  
20 Distribution Market: OEMs).
- 21 3. COUNT 3: Sherman Act § 1 (Unreasonable restraints of trade concerning Android App  
22 Distribution Market: Developer Distribution Agreement).

---

24 <sup>1</sup> See Count 13, Epic Games, Inc. Second Amended Complaint for Injunctive Relief (ECF  
25 No. 378); Thirteenth Cause of Action, Match Group, LLC; Humor Rainbow, Inc.; PlentyOfFish  
26 Media ULC; and People Media, Inc. First Amended Complaint (ECF No. 380); Count 11,  
27 Consumer Plaintiffs Second Amended Class Action Complaint (ECF No. 172); Eighth Cause of  
Action, State Plaintiffs’ First Amended Complaint (3:21-cv-05227-JD ECF No. 188).

- 1 4. COUNT 4: Sherman Act § 1 (Per se unreasonable restraints of trade concerning Android  
2 App Distribution Market: Project Hug (Games Velocity Program) and other Agreements  
3 with Developers).<sup>2</sup>
- 4 5. COUNT 5: Sherman Act § 1 (Unreasonable restraints of trade concerning Android App  
5 Distribution Market: Project Hug (Games Velocity Program) and Apps Velocity Program  
6 and other Agreements with Developers).
- 7 6. COUNT 6: Sherman Act § 2 (Unlawful Monopolization and Monopoly Maintenance in the  
8 Android In-App Payment Processing Market).
- 9 7. COUNT 7: Sherman Act § 1 (Unreasonable restraints of trade concerning Android In-App  
10 Payment Processing Market: Developer Distribution Agreement).
- 11 8. COUNT 8: Sherman Act § 1 (Tying Google Play Store to Google Play Billing).
- 12 9. COUNT 9: California Cartwright Act (Unreasonable restraints of trade in Android App  
13 Distribution Market: OEMs).
- 14 10. COUNT 10: California Cartwright Act (Unreasonable restraints of trade in Android App  
15 Distribution Market: Developer Distribution Agreement).
- 16 11. COUNT 11: California Cartwright Act (Unreasonable restraints of trade in Android In-  
17 App Payment Processing Market: Developer Distribution Agreement).
- 18 12. COUNT 12: California Cartwright Act (Tying Google Play Store to Google Play Billing).

19 **Counterclaims by Google Against Epic**

- 20 1. Breach of Contract
- 21 2. Breach of Implied Covenant of Good Faith and Fair Dealing
- 22 3. Quasi-Contract / Unjust Enrichment
- 23 4. Declaratory Judgment<sup>3</sup>

24  
25 \_\_\_\_\_  
26 <sup>2</sup> As explained in the parties' forthcoming Joint Pretrial Statement, Google disputes that this claim  
is triable by jury.

27 <sup>3</sup> As explained in the parties' forthcoming Joint Pretrial Statement, Epic disputes that Google's  
28 counterclaim for a declaratory judgment against Epic is triable by jury.

**Match Group, LLC, v. Google LLC, No. 3:22-cv-02746-JD**

**Claims by the Match Plaintiffs Against Google**

1. First Cause of Action: Unlawful Tying of Google Play to Google Play Billing; Sherman Act § 1.
2. Second Cause of Action: Unlawful Monopoly Maintenance in the Android App Distribution Market or, Alternatively, the Dating App Distribution Market; Sherman Act § 2.
3. Third Cause of Action: Unreasonable Restraints of Trade in the Android App Distribution Market or, Alternatively, the Dating App Distribution Market: Sherman Act § 1.
4. Fourth Cause of Action: Unreasonable Restraint of Trade in the Android App IAP Market; Sherman Act § 1.
5. Sixth Cause of Action: Per Se Unreasonable Restraints of Trade Concerning Android App Distribution Market: Project Hug (Games Velocity Program) and other Agreements with Developers; Sherman Act § 1.<sup>4</sup>
6. Seventh Cause of Action: Unreasonable Restraints of Trade Concerning Android App Distribution Market: Project Hug (Games Velocity Program) and Apps Velocity Program and other Agreements with Developers; Sherman Act § 1.
7. Eighth Cause of Action: Unlawful Monopoly Maintenance in the Android App IAP Market; Sherman Act § 2.
8. Ninth Cause of Action: Attempted Monopolization of the Android App IAP Market; Sherman Act § 2.
9. Tenth Cause of Action: Unlawful Tying of Google Play to Google Play Billing; Cartwright Act.

---

<sup>4</sup> As explained in the parties' forthcoming Joint Pretrial Statement, Google disputes that this claim is triable by jury.

- 1 10. Eleventh Cause of Action: Unreasonable Restraints of Trade in the Android App
- 2 Distribution Market or, Alternatively, the Dating App Distribution Market; Cartwright Act.
- 3 11. Twelfth Cause of Action: Unreasonable Restraints of Trade in the Android App IAP
- 4 Market; Cartwright Act.
- 5 12. Fourteenth Cause of Action: Tortious Interference with Contract.<sup>5</sup>
- 6 13. Fifteenth Cause of Action: Tortious Interference with Prospective Economic Advantage.<sup>6</sup>

7 **Counterclaims by Google Against the Match Plaintiffs**

- 8 1. Breach of Contract
- 9 2. Breach of Implied Covenant of Good Faith and Fair Dealing
- 10 3. False Promise
- 11 4. Quasi-Contract / Unjust Enrichment
- 12 5. Declaratory Judgment<sup>7</sup>

13 **In re Google Play Consumer Antitrust Litigation, No. 3:20-cv-05761-JD**

14 **Claims by Consumer Plaintiffs Against Google**

- 15 1. COUNT 1: Sherman Act § 2 Unlawful Monopolization in the Android Application
- 16 Distribution Market.
- 17 2. COUNT 2: Sherman Act § 1 Unreasonable Restraints of Trade Concerning the Android
- 18 Application Distribution Market: OEMs.
- 19 3. COUNT 3: Sherman Act § 1 Unreasonable Restraints of Trade Concerning the Android
- 20 Application Distribution Market: Developer Distribution Agreements.
- 21 4. COUNT 4: Sherman Act § 2 Unlawful Monopolization in the In-App Aftermarket.

---

23 <sup>5</sup> As explained in the parties' forthcoming Joint Pretrial Statement, Google disputes that this claim

24 is triable by jury.

25 <sup>6</sup> As explained in the parties' forthcoming Joint Pretrial Statement, Google disputes that this claim

26 is triable by jury.

27 <sup>7</sup> As explained in the parties' forthcoming Joint Pretrial Statement, the Match Plaintiffs dispute

28 that Google's counterclaim for a declaratory judgment against the Match Plaintiffs is triable by jury.

5. COUNT 5: Sherman Act § 1 Unreasonable Restraints of Trade Concerning the In-App Aftermarket.
6. COUNT 6: Sherman Act § 1 Tying In-App Distribution, Including Google Play Billing, to the Google Play Store.
7. COUNT 7: California Cartwright Act Unreasonable Restraints of Trade in the Android Application Distribution Market: OEM Agreements.
8. COUNT 8: California Cartwright Act Unreasonable Restraints of Trade in the Android Application Distribution Market: Developer Agreements.
9. COUNT 9: California Cartwright Act Unreasonable Restraints of Trade in the In-App Aftermarket.
10. COUNT 10: California Cartwright Act Tying In-App Distribution, Including Google Play Billing, to the Google Play Store.

**State of Utah v. Google LLC. 3:21-cv-05227-JD**

**Claims by State Plaintiffs Against Google**

1. ***The States’ Federal and California State Law Claims***

The States assert several Sherman Act and Cartwright Act claims against Google. For these claims, the jury will determine liability and the amount of monetary damages, if any. The Court will determine the appropriate injunctive relief, along with any award of fees, expenses, and costs of suit.

- Unreasonable Restraints of Trade in the Android In-App Billing Market Under § 1 of the Sherman Act and the Cartwright Act. *See* ECF<sup>8</sup> 188, States’ First Am. Compl. (“States’ FAC”) (Counts 6, 8).
- Unlawful Restraints of Trade (*Per Se* and Rule of Reason) in the Android App Distribution Market Under § 1 of the Sherman Act and the Cartwright Act. *See* States’ FAC (Counts 2, 3, 8).

---

<sup>8</sup> *State of Utah et al. v. Google LLC et al.*, 21-cv-05227-JD.

- 1 • Unlawful Tying of Google Play to Google Play Billing Under § 1 of the Sherman Act
- 2 and the Cartwright Act. *See* States' FAC (Counts 4, 8).
- 3 • Unlawful Exclusive Dealing in the Android In-App Billing Market Under the Sherman
- 4 Act § 1 and the Cartwright Act. *See* States' FAC (Counts 7, 8).
- 5 • Unlawful Monopolization/Monopoly Maintenance in the Android App Distribution
- 6 Market and in the Android In-App Billing Market Under the Sherman Act § 2. *See*
- 7 States' FAC (Counts 1, 5).

## 8 2. *The States' Non-California State Law Claims*

9 The States allege violations of the antitrust, consumer protection, and unfair trade practice  
 10 laws of various States, Commonwealths, and Districts.<sup>9</sup> The States also allege violations  
 11 (identified in States' FAC Section III) of the consumer protection and unfair trade practice laws of  
 12 various States, Commonwealths, and Districts.<sup>10</sup>

13 For these claims, the jury will determine liability and the amount of monetary damages, if  
 14 any, for these claims. The jury will make any assessment of whether the relevant conduct was

---

15  
 16 <sup>9</sup> *See, e.g.*, Alaska Stat. §§ 45.50.562, 45.50.564, 45.50.471; Ariz. Rev. Stat. §§ 44-1402, 44-1403,  
 17 44-1522; Ark. Code §§ 4-75-206, 4-75-302; Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 16720, 16726; Colo. Rev.  
 18 Stat. §§ 6-4-104, 6-4-105; Conn. Gen. Stat. §§ 35-26, 35-27, 42-110b; Del. Code tit. 6, § 2103;  
 19 D.C. Code §§ 28-3904, 28-4502, 28-4503; Fla. Stat. §§ 501.204, 542.18, 542.19; Idaho Code  
 20 §§ 48-104, 48-105; Ind. Code §§ 24-1-2-1, 24-1-2-2, 24-5-0.5-3; Iowa Code §§ 553.4-5, 714.16;  
 21 Ky. Rev. Stat. § 367.175; La. Rev. Stat. tit. 51, §§ 122-124; Md. Com. Law Code § 11-204; Mass.  
 22 Gen. Laws ch. 93A, § 2; Minn. Stat. § 325D.51, 325D.52; Miss. Code §§ 75-21-1, 75-21-3, 75-24-  
 23 5; Mo. Rev. Stat. §§ 416.031, 407.020; Mont. Code §§ 30-14-205, 30-14-103; Neb. Rev. Stat.  
 24 §§ 59-801, 59-802, 59-1602, 59-1603, 59-1604; Nev. Rev. Stat. §§ 598A.060, 598.0923; N.H.  
 25 Rev. Stat. §§ 356:2, 356:3; N.J. Stat. §§ 56:9-3, 56:9-4, 56:8-2, 56:8-4; N.M. Stat. §§ 57-1-1, 57-  
 26 1-2; N.Y. Gen. Bus. Law § 340; N.Y. Exec. Law § 63(12); N.C. Gen. Stat. §§ 75-1, 75-1.1, 75-2,  
 27 75-2.1; N.D. Cent. Code §§ 51-08.1-02; 51-08.1-03; 79 Okla. Stat. § 203; Or. Rev. Stat.  
 28 §§ 646.725, 646.730; R.I. Gen. Law §§ 6-36-4, 6-36-5; S.D. Codified Laws §§ 37-1-3.1, 37-1-3.2;  
 Tex. Bus. & Com. Code § 15.05; Utah Code §§ 76-10-3104, 13-11-4; 9 Vt. Stat. § 2453; Va. Code  
 §§ 59.1-9.5, 59.1-9.6; Wash. Rev. Code §§ 19.86.020, 19.86.030, 19.86.040; W. Va. Code §§ 47-  
 18-3, 47-18-4.

<sup>10</sup> *See, e.g.*, Alaska Stat. § 45.50.471; Ariz. Rev. Stat. § 44-1522; Ark. Code § 4-88-107; Colo.  
 Rev. Stat. § 6-1-105; Conn. Gen. Stat. § 42-110b; D.C. Code § 28-3904; Fla. Stat. § 501.204; Ind.  
 Code § 24-5-0.5-3; Iowa Code § 714.16; Ky. Rev. Stat. § 367.170; La. Rev. Stat. tit. 51, § 1405;  
 Mass. Gen. Laws ch. 93A, § 2; Miss. Code § 75-24-5; Mo. Rev. Stat. § 407.020; Mont. Code § 30-



1 knowing or willful. The Court will determine the injunctive relief, disgorgement and/or restitution,  
2 civil penalties, fees, expenses, and costs, and other equitable relief, if any.<sup>11</sup>

3  
4 DATED: October 2, 2023

HUESTON HENNIGAN LLP

5  
6 By: s/ Douglas J. Dixon

Douglas J. Dixon

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

Match Group, LLC, Humor Rainbow, Inc.,

PlentyofFish Media ULC, and People Media, Inc.

7  
8  
9  
10 DATED: October 2, 2023

OFFICE OF THE UTAH ATTORNEY GENERAL

11  
12  
13 By: s/ Brendan P. Glackin

Brendan P. Glackin

Attorneys for Plaintiff States

14  
15  
16 DATED: October 2, 2023

BARTLIT BECK LLP

17  
18 By: s/ Karma M. Giulianelli

Karma M. Giulianelli

Lead Counsel for the Proposed Class

19  
20  
21  
22  
23 14-103; Nev. Rev. Stat. §§ 598.0915, 598.0923; N.H. Rev. Stat. § 358-A:2; N.J. Stat. § 56:8-2;  
24 N.M. Stat. § 57-12-3; N.Y. Gen. Bus. Law § 349; N.Y. Exec. Law § 63(12); N.C. Gen. Stat. § 75-  
25 1.1; N.D. Cent. Code § 51-15-02; 15 Okla. Stat. § 753; S.D. Codified Laws § 37-24-6; Tex. Bus.  
& Com. Code § 17.46; Utah Code § 13-11-4; 9 Vt. Stat. § 2453; Wash. Rev. Code § 19.86.020.

26 <sup>11</sup> Google and the State Plaintiffs have met and conferred, and Google objects on the ground that  
27 the State Plaintiffs have not provided a “list of the *specific* claims” that the States intend to assert  
28 against Google, as the Court requested. MDL Dkt. 571 at 2 (emphasis added). Google further  
objects to the extent the State Plaintiffs are asserting any *per se* claim that was not pleaded in their  
complaint.

1 DATED: October 2, 2023

KAPLAN FOX & KILSHEIMER LLP

2  
3 By: s/ Hae Sung Nam

4 Hae Sung Nam

5 Co-Lead Counsel for the Proposed Class

6 DATED: October 2, 2023

FAEGRE DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP

7  
8 By: s/ Paul J. Riehle

9 Paul J. Riehle

10 Counsel for Plaintiff Epic Games, Inc.

11  
12 DATED: October 2, 2023

CRAVATH, SWAINE & MOORE LLP

13  
14 By: s/ Christine A. Varney

15 Christine A. Varney (*pro hac vice*)

16 Counsel for Plaintiff Epic Games, Inc.

17  
18 DATED: October 2, 2023

MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP

19  
20 By: s/ Glenn D. Pomerantz

21 Glenn D. Pomerantz

22 Attorneys for Defendants Google LLC et al.

23  
24 DATED: October 2, 2023

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

25  
26 By: s/ Brian C. Rocca

27 Brian C. Rocca

28 Attorneys for Defendants Google LLC et al.

**CIVIL L.R. 5-1(i)(3) ATTESTATION**

Pursuant to Civil L.R. 5-1(i)(3), the filer of this document attests that concurrence in the filing of the document has been obtained from each of the other signatories.

By: s/ Glenn D. Pomerantz  
Glenn D. Pomerantz